

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 7, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto.

In connection with the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 13-15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lockhart et al in view of Haukka et al, the examiner states that “Haukka is relied on for the teaching of creating an offer message listing DRM methods supported by the client (i.e., client sends a client list of support DRM methods (e.g., supported security mechanisms) to the server, see Haukka: 0028).” The examiner’s argument assumes, without support, that a security mechanism is suggestive of a DRM method. Such an assumption is erroneous because the security mechanisms as taught by Haukka cannot be applied to encoded content. The security methods specify a type of interaction between a client and server that is used to authenticate the client. Thereafter, the authenticated client is given an authenticated status. Authentication is not an enabler for the decoding of encoded content. The rejection fails to provide any reasoning for why a security mechanism should be considered to be equivalent with a DRM method.

Haukka further fails to teach that the server informs the client of the types of “security mechanism” that are supported. The Haukka server merely picks a method and then uses it. In contrast, claims 1 and 13 recite that the server provides an answer message that indicates whether each DRM method listed in the offer message is supported by the server. Then the client selects which one to use. Thus, the combination of Lockhart and Haukka fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The final rejection relies on Lockhart for disclosure of an answer message, stating that “Lockhart discloses web retailer provides consumer with a link specifies an Internet from which consumer may download and install permit.” However, the recited answer message indicates whether each DRM method listed in the offer message is supported by the target server. The final rejection has not offered any reasoning for the recited limitation being taught or suggested by the cited references.

The final rejection further argues that “respective DRM license servers for different supported DRM methods” is not recited in the claims. Applicant’s remarks being referred to by the examiner concerned the lack of any motivation of one skilled in the art to send to a client a respective network address for a particular DRM license server since the system of Lockhart only has one server (i.e., there is not more than one server to choose from). Moreover, the comments go to a logical result of the claimed limitations. Because of the recited limitations, the present invention performs valuable functions when connected in a system with different respective DRM servers. Neither Lockhart nor Haukka can perform the same functions. This demonstrates the significance of the claim differences (which do not need to be recited in the claims in order to be relevant to the discussion).

In view of the foregoing remarks, claims 1-7 and 13-16 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: August 7, 2007  
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(734) 542-0900